REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-16, 18, 19, and 25-29 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claim 1 has been amended as shown on page 2 of the reply. In addition, claim 12 has been cancelled herein. Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   **Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, and 28 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1, 4, 6, 10-13, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al. (US 6,363,503) in view of Jenkins et al. (US 6,002,868) further in view of Rohall et al. (US 7,392,280). It is requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. The cited references, when taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all aspects recited in the subject claims.

> [T]he prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all claim limitations. *See* MPEP §706.02(j). *See In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). *See In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). [W]hen the prior art teaches away from combining certain known elements, discovery of a successful means of combining them is more likely to be non-obvious. *See KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) *citing United States v. Adams*, 383 U. S. 39, 51-52 (1966). A factfinder should be aware, of course, of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and must be cautious of arguments reliant upon *ex post* reasoning. See *KSR v. Teleflex*, 550 U.S. ___, 127 S. Ct. 1727 (2007) citing Graham v. John Deere Co. of Kansas City, 383 U. S. 1, 36 (warning against a "temptation to read into the prior art the teachings of the invention in issue" and instructing courts to "'guard against slipping into the use of hindsight'" (*quoting Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co.*, 332 F. 2d 406, 412 (CA6 1964))).

The claimed subject matter relates to facilitating designation of appropriate responses to system events. Upon the occurrence of a system event, message components are received. Message components include a plurality of messages specifying context and a rationale relating to the event and/or an aspect of the event. Messages components can provide multiple levels of information, such as, for example, information at a high level, information at a low level, and information at other levels therebetween. To this end, independent claim 1 recites, in part, *a format component that formats a user interface employed to display messages in accordance*

with format information included in the messages component, the format information includes graphical objects and associated functionality that are to be available to a user. The cited references do not teach or suggest such aspects.

Clauss et al. relates to a processing and representing error messages within a computer-aided design environment. A function that results in an error when executing stores the error in a central storage location. Any calling functions that called the failed function do not add its own error message to the storage location. (*See* col. 4, ll. 7-42). The error is displayed in a hierarchical manner where each level of the display hierarchy is a different level of information. (*See* col. 6, ll. 1-3). While the display includes a help button (*See* 422, 472 and 540 of Figs. 4 and 5), the button is a mechanism to enable a user to request additional help (*See* col. 5, ll. 44-47 and col. 6, ll. 38-40).

Jenkins et al. relates to a diagnostic application that includes a plurality of independent test modules. A front end module issues commands to lower level modules. In addition, a test definition tool is disclosed that facilitates visual development of test scripts via moving icons from one list to another. (*See* Abstract). Diagnostic library modules can be dispatched and controlled by higher level modules. Diagnostic library modules can identify hardware devices, specify tests, and execute tests. An error handler module is provided that retains error information gathered by diagnostic library modules. Error information can be provided to a user. In addition, a recommended action module retains information on what to do to fix an error. This information is employed by an error handler to recommend an action or response. (*See* col. 7, ln. 46 – col. 8, ln. 39). A front end module can display errors and actions. (*See* col. 8, ll. 46-48).

Rohall et al. relates to summarizing email message threads. In particular, Rohall et al. discloses presentation of an email summary when a user clicks on an email message or hovers over an email message. This selection or hovering in Rohall et al. triggers a display of an email summary (e.g., a presentation of content associated with the selected or hovered object). In the claimed subject matter, hovering on a menu item (e.g., a link to an informational source) results in the corresponding message in the hierarchically organized plurality of messages.

However, the cited references fail to disclose a formatting component as recited in claim 1. Clauss et al. relates to handling errors, reporting errors and representing errors to a user. Clauss et al. discloses an error reporting user that can include various graphical elements such as

an exclamation point in a triangle to signify an error and a plus symbol to indicate that additional information is available via a single help button. (*See* col. 6, ll. 25-37). However, Clauss et al. is silent regarding a formatting component that formats a user interface employed to display messages wherein the user interface is formatted in accordance with formatting information included within the messages. Rather, Clauss et al. discloses an arbitrary pre-developed interface format. Rohall et al. and Jenkins et al. fail to cure these deficiencies of Clauss et al. with respect to independent claim 1.

Independent claim 13 recites, in part, *means for formatting a user interface based upon format information in the plurality of messages*. As stated supra, Clauss et al. relates to mechanism for error handling, reporting and representation. Clauss et al. discloses an error reporting user that can include various graphical elements such as an exclamation point in a triangle to signify an error and a plus symbol to indicate that additional information is available via a single help button. (*See* col. 6, ll. 25-37). However, Clauss et al. does not teach or suggest formatting the user interface in accordance with format information included in the plurality of messages as recited in claim 13. Rather, Clauss et al. discloses displaying an interface in accordance with an arbitrary pre-developed interface format and is silent regarding formatting in accordance with information included in messages. Rohall et al. and Jenkins et al. fail to cure the aforementioned deficiencies.

In addition, independent claim 16 recites, in part, *analyzing format information included in the message component, the format information specifies graphical objects and associated functionality that are to be available to a user in a user interface employed to display the list of messages*. As described above, Clauss et al. discloses a particular interface format and fails to teach or suggest messages including format information that specifies graphical objects and associated functionality available to a user in a user interface. Clauss et al. fails to teach or suggest such customizability of an interface that displays messages. Rather, Clauss et al. employs a rigid, preset interface design.

In view of at least the foregoing, it is readily apparent that the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the invention as recited in independent claim 1, 13 and 16 (and associated dependent claims). Accordingly, this rejection should be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

II.   Rejection of Claims 5 and 27 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Pangburn (US 7,152,226). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 5 depends from independent claim 1 and claim 27 depends from claim 16. Pangburn does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. with respect to independent claims 1 and 16.

III.   Rejection of Claims 7-8, 14, and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-8, 14, an 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Pittore (US 6,414,699). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claims 7, 8, 14 depend from claim 1 and claim 29 depends from independent claim 16. Pittore does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. with respect to independent claims 1 and 16.

IV.   Rejection of Claim 9 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Boulton et al. (US 5,566,291). is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 9 depends from independent claim 1. Boulton et al. does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. with respect to independent claim 1.

V.   Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al. in view of Spellman et al. (US 6,667,747). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Claim 15 depends from independent claim 13 and Spellman et al. does not cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Clauss et al., Jenkins et al. and Rohall et al with respect to independent claim 13.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP618US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicant's undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

 /Evan T. Perry/
Evan T. Perry
Reg. No. 62,190

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731